DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 811 SP 029 011

AUTHOR Pearce, Judy A.; Loyd, Brenda H.
TITLE Differences in Teacher Behavior by Amount of Teacher Experience.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *Classroom Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; Student Behavior; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

This study examined 665 elementary and secondary teachers with different levels of experience to discover differences and similarities in selected teaching behaviors. Of the 57 behaviors, 16 were clustered into teacher response to student response to a question or to a student initiation. Sixteen related to teacher response to inattentive or disruptive student behavior. The remaining 25 were considered general teacher behaviors. Each teacher's classroom was observed by a single observer who recorded the behavior of the teacher and certain student behaviors during timed three-minute periods. The results of the study suggest that teacher behavior does differ for teachers with different levels of experience. The primary difference between novice and experienced teachers was less the type of behavior exhibited than the number of behaviors and the degree to which they were demonstrated. It is suggested that beginning teachers have not yet developed the routine or systematic approaches to instruction and classroom management that appear to characterize experienced teachers. The 57 behaviors observed are listed in Table 1 and described in the appendix. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283811

Differences in Teacher Behavior by Amount of Teacher Experience

Judy A. Pearce

and

Brenda H. Loyd

University of Virginia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. A. Pearce

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April, 1987

SP 029 011

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study examines differences and similarities among 665 teachers with different levels of experience on 58 teaching behaviors. Less experienced teachers exhibited a wider range of behaviors and demonstrated them more frequently than did experienced teachers.

Differences in Teacher Behavior by Amount of Teacher Experience

The value of teaching experience as a determinant of teacher behavior is unresolved. On the one hand, experience is perceived as the primary way teachers develop their teaching skills and abilities (Huberman, 1985). Others suggest that there is little evidence that teaching improves with experience alone (Gage and Berliner, 1979). Recent research, guided in part by the process-product paradigm, enables the identification of behavorial differences between experienced and novice teachers from which inferences may be drawn regarding differences in effectiveness.

Significance of Study

Recent studies which examine the relationship between classroom teacher behavior and teaching experience support the notion that behavorial differences can be identified. In longitudinal studies, both Ayers (1980) and Adams (1979, 1982) found that teacher behavior does change over time. Ayers reported that indirect to direct teaching ratios increased during the first few years of teaching. Indirect teaching is defined as teaching with a pupil oriented/supportive focus. Demonstrable teacher behaviors associated with indirect teaching are allowing students to express their feelings, praising students, showing a sense of humor, and accepting and using student ideas. Direct teaching has a more teacher-oriented focus with the teacher more directive and assertive.

Adams found increases in three areas: organized/systematic behavior, affective teaching, and surgent/stimulating behavior.

Organized/systematic behavior is identified by characteristics such as responsible, confident, systematic, integrated, and steady as opposed to evading, uncertain, disorganized, immature, and erratic. Affective teaching is characterized by the qualities of democracy, responsiveness, understanding, kindliness, adaptability, and optimism. Stimulating, original, and alert are qualities of surgent/stimulating behavior.

Sandefur (1969) reported that certain teaching behaviors are significantly positively modified by teaching experience including fairness, kindliness, responsiveness, understanding, poise, confidence, and certain teaching methods. Edelmann and Furst (1969) noted significant differences in the manner in which experienced and novice teachers responded to difficult classroom situations, with more experienced teachers tending to exhibit less punitive behavior. In a study designed to compare novice and experienced teachers of both sexes in terms of types of teaching behaviors, Fagot (1977) found that experienced teachers demonstrated behavior identified as positive more frequently than inexperienced teachers. These behaviors included making more favorable comments, giving more information, helping children, and asking more questions. Experienced teachers tended to identify and structure the learning task to an extent not seen in less experienced teachers.

Using three levels of teaching experience, Young (1979) identified rapidly paced, interactive instruction as associated with more experienced teachers. Fogarty, et al (1983) studied the classroom behavior of experienced and novice teachers in terms of use of student cues, instructional responses to cues,

and teachers' instructional goals and prior knowledge. Experienced teachers used a wider variety of instructional actions and exhibited more complex associations between cues and responses. Osborne (1985) found that experienced teachers took a more task-oriented approach, one identified as positive, than did novice teachers when interacting with children displaying distractible behavior. Research by Berliner (1986) and Leinhardt & Greeno (1986) indicates that experienced teachers develop schemas or routines for the classroom while novice teachers do not work in a routine or habitual way.

When teachers themselves were asked how they learned to teach, not surprisingly they reported the main way was by experience. Teachers in Lortie's (1975) study were interested in finding what "works for me." The majority of teachers in Huberman's study (1985) of teacher knowledge reported that experimentation until lectures and exercises work better was their prime means of mastering various aspects of teaching.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to corroborate other research findings by investigating the relationship between specific teacher behaviors and years of teaching experience and to identify along what dimensions such differences might exist.

Methodology

Data. Data on teacher behaviors were collected from 665 classrooms from eight school districts across Virginia. The districts were randomly selected. Of the 665 teachers who volunteered, 79% were female and 21% were male. Thirty-one percent of the teachers in Group 1 had less than six years of

experience; the 69% who comprised Group 2 had six or more years of experience. Classrooms from first through twelfth grade were represented in the sample; 64% of the classrooms were grades 1-6 and 36% were grades 7-12.

The data were obtained by educators trained to record teacher behaviors. Only observers reaching a 75% or greater agreement with the criteria were certified as observers.

Instrumentation. The teacher behaviors of interest were part of an observational instrument developed for Virginia teacher certification which is composed of 156 items. The instrument was low inference; that is, observers recorded specific behaviors which occurred without any evaluation of the behavior.

The 57 behaviors of interest are described in the Appendix. Of the 57 behaviors, sixteen were clustered into teacher response to student response to a question or a student initiation. Sixteen related to teacher response to inattentive or disruptive behavior. The remaining twenty-five were considered general teacher behaviors.

Procedures. Observers were randomly assigned to classrooms. Each classroom was observed by a single observer who recorded behavior of the teacher and certain student behaviors during timed three-minute periods. A modified sign system was used. That is, each teacher behavior was marked only once during the three-minute period regardless of frequency of occurrence. Each teacher was observed for seven three-minute periods across a 50-minute session. Scores were created for each teacher by summing data across the seven observations.

Analysis

The question of which dimensions describe the behaviors of teachers with different amounts of experience was addressed by factor analyzing the set of 57 behaviors separately for each of the two groups of teachers and comparing the resulting factor structures.

The question of differences in teacher behavior by amount of experience was addressed by a discriminant analysis procedure. The independent variables were the two classifications of amount of teaching experience (five years or less; six years and more). The dependent variables were the 57 behaviors described above.

Significant variables in the discriminant function and the factor analyses were followed up by t-tests.

Results.

Factor Analysis. Four factors for inexperienced teachers (0-5 years) and three factors for experienced teachers (6+ years) emerge from the data. The four factors for inexperienced teachers could be labeled: (1) questioning, (2) positive instructional and personal interaction, (3) disruptive and behavorial management, and (4) positive affect. The three factors for experienced teachers could be labeled: (1) positive instructional and personal interaction, (2) disruptive responses, and (3) positive affect.

The first factor for teachers with 0-5 years of experience is strongly defined by questioning items, with one item of teacher response to inattentive behavior. There is no similar factor for experienced teachers. See Table 1.

Insert Table 1 Here

Factor loadings for the second factor for inexperienced teachers could be labeled positive instructional and personal interaction. This factor contains instructional interaction items such as teacher gives step-by-step instructions, asks learner to explain work, checks understanding, and corrects learner error; personal interaction items include helping learner, recognizing special need of learner, and showing consideration for and being courteous to the learner. This factor also includes teacher approval in response to a student response to a convergent question, and questioned group about work. A similar factor appears for experienced teachers. See Table 2. The difference between the two is that the factor for experienced teachers does not include two items: teacher approving a student response to a convergent question and questioned group about work.

Insert Table 2 Here

The third factor for novice teachers loads on teacher response to students displaying disruptive behavior as well as two behavorial management items: reminded learner of rule, and called for quiet and order. Corrected learner error also loads on this factor. A similar factor for experienced teachers is comprised entirely of teacher responses to student disruptive behavior. This factor for experienced teachers does not include the behavorial management items or corrected learner error.

The fourth factor for inexperienced teachers loads strongly on positive affect: convergent praise, divergent praise, asked learner about feelings, praised learner publicly, gave reason for praise, and allowed learner choice of activity.

The final factor for experienced teachers could also be termed positive affect; items which load on this factor are convergent praise, convergent approval, and praise learner publicly.

The final factor for novices and the final factor for inexperienced teachers have in common the variables convergent praise and praise learner publicly. The difference between them is that the factor for novices is stronger, including the additional behaviors of divergent praise, asked learner about feelings, gave reason for praise and allowed learner choice of activity.

Discriminant Analysis. The discriminant function further defines the two groups of teachers. The results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 3. The discriminant function was significant with a Chi Square of 103.34, a Wilks Lambda of .85, with 57 degrees of freedom, both significant at $p<.01$. Percent of cases correctly classified was 74.07.

Insert Table 3 Here

The results of the discriminant function support the characteristics of the factor analysis. Table 4 lists the standardized discriminant function coefficients. The eleven items in the discriminant function could be clustered on questioning, behavorial management, and positive affect.

Questioning items included teacher praise to student response to a convergent question, teacher approves student response to a convergent question, and teacher rejects a learner initiated question, comment, or statement; behavorial management items were eye contact with an inattentive learner, public rebuke to an inattentive learner, and public rebuke to a disruptive learner. Positive affect items were showed sense of humor, praised learner publicly, gave reason for praise, and allowed learner choice of activity. The item ignored learner answer/comment fit no classification.

Insert Table 4 Here

Of the eleven items with coefficients greater than .20 which identify the discriminant function, inexperienced teachers demonstrated eight of them more frequently than experienced teachers. The eight behaviors demonstrated more often by novices were: convergent praise, convergent approval, learner initiated rejects, eye contact with inattentive learner, desist to a disruptive learner, public rebuke to a disruptive learner, praise learner publicly, and allowed learner choice of activity. Experienced teachers more frequently showed a sense of humor, gave reason for praise, and ignored learner answer/comment.

T-Tests. T-tests were significant for nine of the items. Results of the t-tests are presented in Table 5. Of these nine items, six were also identified by the coefficients of the discriminant function: convergent praise, convergent approval, eye contact with inattentive learner, public rebuke to a

disruptive learner, desist to a disruptive learner, and praise learner publicly. For all nine items, inexperienced teachers exhibited the behaviors more frequently than did experienced teachers.

Insert Table 5 Here

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that teacher behavior does differ for teachers with different levels of experience. The primary difference between novice and experienced teachers is less the type of behavior exhibited than the number of behaviors and the degree to which they are demonstrated. Of the three factors shared by both groups of teachers, more behaviors for beginning teachers contributed to defining the factors than for experienced teachers. This may suggest that beginning teachers have not yet developed routine or systematic approaches to instruction and classroom management that appear to characterize experienced teachers or "expert teachers" as described by the Berliner (1986) and Leinhardt & Greeno (1986) studies. Rather, they appear to be trying a variety of behaviors. Also, it is not a matter of novices consistently demonstrating "better" behavior. For example, beginning teachers more frequently rejected a learner initiated statement, comment, or question. Beginning teachers may simply be trying more things more often. The beginning teacher who emerges from this study resembles that of the "sole practitioner" depicted by Lortie (1975) and Huberman (1985), that is, the teacher experimenting in the classroom to find what works best.

However, that beginning teachers in this study exhibit certain behaviors more frequently is inconsistent with other research findings. For example, Ayers (1980) reported that behaviors associated with indirect teaching increase in relation to direct teaching behavior. These behaviors include allowing students to express their feelings, praising students, and accepting and using student ideas. Of the five behaviors which load on the questioning factor for novice teachers, three relate to a divergent teacher question and one is a learner initiated question, comment, or statement. This factor may indicate that beginning teachers in this study demonstrate a more indirect teaching style as exemplified by divergent questions which elicit student ideas and opinions.

The results of this study suggest the need for additional research. One area for further study might be how novice teachers, as they continue in the classroom, select the behaviors which they feel work for them out of the repetoire which they initially demonstrate.

References

Adams, R. D. (1979). Critical findings from the Teacher Preparation Evaluation Program: Teacher entry, retention and change. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Adams, R. D. (1982). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions across time. A paper presented at the Annual American Educational Research Association meeting, New York.

Ayers, J. B. (1980). A longitudinal study of teachers. A paper presented at the Annual American Educational Research Association meeting, Boston.

Berliner, D. C. (1986). In Pursuit of the Expert Pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15(7), 5-13.

Edelmann, A. E. & Furst, N. F. (1969). Changing teacher response behavior to those more consistent with good mental health practices. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Fagot, B. I. (1977). Preschool sex sterotyping: Effect of sex of teacher vs. training of teacher. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans.

Fogarty, J. L., Wang, M. C., & Creek, R. (1983). A descriptive study of experienced and novice teachers' interactive instructional thoughts and actions. Journal of Education Research, 77(1), 22-32.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1979). Educational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Huberman, M. (1985). What knowledge is of most worth to teachers? A knowledge-use perspective. Teaching and Teacher Education, 1(3), 251-262.

Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J. G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78(2), 75-95.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Osborne, S. (1985). Effects of teacher experience and selected temperament variables on coping strategies used with distractible children. American Educational Research Journal, 22(1), 79-86.

Sandefur, J. T., & others (1969). Teaching experience as a modifier of teaching behavior. Final Report. Emporia: Kansas State Teachers College. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 035 598)

Young, J. R. (1979). A discriminant analysis of a teaching model using three levels of teaching experience. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Table 1

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix for Teachers with 0-5 years

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Teacher Response to Learner Response				
Convergent praise				.52
Divergent praise				.39
Learner initiated praise				
Convergent approves		.40		
Divergent approves	.70			
Learner initiated approves				
Convergent acknowledges				
Divergent acknowledges	.70			
Learner initiated acknowledges	.64			
Convergent gives answer	.48			
Divergent gives answer	.83			
Learner initiated gives answer				
Convergent rejects				
Divergent rejects				
Learner initiated rejects				
Convergent criticize				
Divergent criticize				
Teacher Response to Inattentive or Disruptive				
Ignore inattentive learner				
Ignore disruptive learner			.55	
Eye contact w/inattentive	.68			
Eye contact w/disruptive			.45	
Move toward inattentive				
Move toward disruptive			.53	
Check status of inattentive				
Check status of disruptive			.39	
Ask academic question/inattentive				
Ask academic question/disruptive				
Cite rule to inattentive				
Cite rule to disruptive			.38	
Desist to inattentive				
Desist to disruptive			.45	
Public rebuke to inattentive				
Public rebuke to disruptive				
General Teacher Behavior				
Gave step-by-step instructions				
Questioned group about work		.48		
Helped learner		.41		

(table continues)

Table 1 Continues

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Asked learner to explain work		.61		
Urged learner answer/comment		.65		
Urged learner to try harder				
Reassured learner		.57		
Checked understanding		.61		
Corrected learner error			.45	
Reminded learner of rule			.46	
Recognized special need of learner		.47		
Ignored learner bid for attention				
Ignored learner answer/comment				
Lost touch with class				
Stayed in same place				
Summarized			.72	
Called for quiet, order				
Showed sense of humor				
Showed consideration for learner		.70		
Showed irritation				
Was courteous to learner		.59		
Asked learner about feelings				.36
Praised learner publicly				.65
Gave reason for praise				.55
Allowed learner choice of activity				.43

Table 2

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix for Teachers with 6+ years Experience

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Teacher Response to Learner Response				
Convergent praise			.62	
Divergent praise				
Learner initiated praise				
Convergent approves			.50	
Divergent approves				
Learner initiated approves				
Convergent acknowledges				
Divergent acknowledges				
Learner initiated acknowledges				
Convergent gives answer				
Divergent gives answere				
Learner initiated gives answer				
Convergent rejects				
Divergent rejects				
Learner initiated rejects				
Convergent criticize				
Divergent criticize				
Teacher Response to Inattentive or Disruptive				
Ignore inattentive learner				
Ignore disruptive learner		.62		
Eye contact w/inattentive				
Eye contact w/disruptive		.59		
Move toward inattentive				
Move toward disruptive		.54		
Check status of inattentive				
Check status of disruptive		.45		
Ask academic question/inattentive				
Ask academic question/disruptive				
Cite rule to inattentive				
Cite rule to disruptive		.51		
Desist to inattentive				
Desist to disruptive		.51		
Public rebuke to inattentive				
Public rebuke to disruptive		.47		

Table 2 Continues

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
General Teacher Behavior				
Gave step-by-step instructions	.43			
Questioned group about work				
Helped learner	.64			
Asked learner to explain work	.51			
Urged learner answer/comment				
Urged learner to try harder	.38			
Reassured learner	.63			
Checked understanding	.50			
Corrected learner error	.44			
Reminded learner of rule				
Recognized special need of learner	.54			
Ignored learner bid for attention				
Ignored learner answer/comment				
Lost touch with class				
Stayed in same place				
Summarized				
Called for quiet, order				
Showed sense of humor				
Showed consideration for learner	.59			
Showed irritation				
Was courteous to learner	.45			
Asked learner about feelings				
Praised learner publicly			.49	
Gave reason for praise				
Allowed learner choice of activity				

Table 3

Canonical Discriminant Function

Wilks Lambda	Chi-Squared	DF	Significance
.85	103.34	57	.0001

Classification Results

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2
Group 1 (0-5 yrs.)	108	72 66.7%	36 33.3%
Group 2 (6+ yrs.)	540	132 24.4%	408 75.6%
Ungrouped	17	4 23.5%	13 76.5%

Percent of grouped cases classified correctly: 74.07

Table 4

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variable Name	Coefficient
Teacher Response to Learner Response	
Convergent praise	.25
Divergent praise	-.06
Convergent approves	.32
Divergent approves	.07
Learner initiated approves	.01
Convergent acknowledges	.05
Divergent acknowledges	-.01
Learner initiated acknowledges	.03
Convergent gives answer	-.14
Divergent gives answer	.05
Learner initiated gives answer	.17
Convergent rejects	-.18
Divergent rejects	.04
Learner initiated rejects	.22
Convergent criticize	-.06
Divergent criticize	.18
Teacher Response to Inattentive or Disruptive	
Ignore inattentive learner	-.03
Ignore disruptive learner	.15
Eye contact w/inattentive	.22
Eye contact w/disruptive	-.07
Move toward inattentive	-.04
Move toward disruptive	-.06
Check status of inattentive	.06
Check status of disruptive	-.17
Ask academic question/inattentive	.14
Ask academic question/disruptive	.09
Cite rule to inattentive	.00
Cite rule to disruptive	-.04
Desist to inattentive	.02
Desist to disruptive	.32
Public rebuke to inattentive	.00
Public rebuke to disruptive	.45

(table continues)

Table 4 Continues

Variable Name	Coefficient
General Teacher Behaviors	
Gave step-by-step instructions	.07
Questioned group about work	.07
Helped learner	-.04
Asked learner to explain work	-.03
Urged learner answer/comment	-.03
Urged learner to try harder	-.01
Reassured learner	-.20
Checked Understanding	.04
Corrected learner error	.04
Reminded learner of rule	.06
Recognized special need of learner	-.06
Ignored learner bid for attention	-.04
Ignored learner answer/comment	-.22
Lost touch with class	-.10
Stayed in same place	-.02
Summarized	.13
Called for quiet, order	.06
Showed sense of humor	-.23
Showed consideration for learner	.11
Showed irritation	-.10
Was courteous to learner	-.19
Asked learner about feelings	.12
Praised learner publicly	.22
Gave reason for praise	-.22
Allowed learner choice of activity	.22

Table 5

Significant T-Tests

Variable	t	df	sign
Convergent Praise	15.26	647	.0001
Convergent Approves	11.99	647	.0006
Eye Contact/Inattentive	11.39	647	.0008
Public Rebuke/Disrupt	17.59	647	.0000
Desist/Disrupt	11.06	647	.0009
Reassured Learner	8.26	647	.0042
Reminded Learner of Rule	7.31	647	.0071
Called for Quiet, Order	11.58	647	.0007
Praised Learner Publicly	7.183	647	.0075

Appendix

Behavorial Items and Descriptions

Questioning

Convergent Praise. Teacher praises a student response to a convergent question. A convergent question is one to which the teacher expects one particular answer.

Divergent Praise. Teacher praises a student response to a divergent question. A divergent question is one for which the teacher will accept a variety of answers.

Learner Initiated Praise. Student volunteers a statement, comment, or question which the teacher praises.

Convergent Approves. Teacher indicates a student response to a convergent question is correct or acceptable.

Divergent Approves. Teacher indicates a student response to a divergent question is correct or acceptable.

Learner Initiated Approves. Teacher approves a statement, question, or comment volunteered by a student.

Convergent Acknowledges. A teacher indicates that she has heard a learner's response to a convergent question without any feedback as to its correctness or incorrectness.

Divergent Acknowledges. A teacher indicates that she has heard a learner's response to a divergent question without any feedback as to its correctness or incorrectness.

Learner Initiated Acknowledges. Teacher indicates that she has heard a learner initiated question, comment, or statement without giving feedback as to its correctness or incorrectness.

(appendix continues)

Convergent Gives Answer. A teacher asks a convergent question and then gives the answer.

Divergent Gives Answer. A teacher asks a divergent question and then gives the answer.

Learner Initiated Gives Answer. The learner voluntarily asks a question which the teacher answers.

Convergent Rejects. Teacher clearly indicates a learner response to a convergent question is incorrect but without indicating criticism or displeasure.

Divergent Rejects. Teacher clearly indicates a learner response to a convergent question is unacceptable but without indicating criticism or displeasure.

Learner Initiated Rejects. Teacher clearly indicates a voluntary learner comment, question, or statement is unacceptable but witnout indicating criticism or displeasure.

Convergent Criticize. Teacher shows displeasure or disapproval of a learner's response to a convergent question.

Divergent Criticize. Teacher shows displeasure of disapproval of a learner's response to a divergent question.

Teacher Response to Inattentive or Disruptive Learner Behavior Ignore Inattentive Learner. Teacher paid no attention to a learner who does not appear to be engaged in the activity structured for him but not disrupting the class.

Ignore Disruptive Learner. Teacher paid no attention to a learner who was not engaged in the task structured for him and who was exhibiting behavior noticed by other students.

(appendix continues)

Eye Contact with Inattentive Learner. Teacher catches the eye of a learner not engaged in the task structured for him but who is not disrupting the class.

Eye Contact with Disruptive Learner. Teacher catches the eye of a learner not engaged in the task structured for him and who was exhibiting behavior noticed by other students.

Move Toward Inattentive Learner. Teacher moves toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him but who is not disrupting the class.

Move Toward Disruptive Learner. Teacher moves toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for nim and who was exhibiting behavior noticed by other students.

Check Status of Inattentive Learner. Teacher asks a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him but who is not disrupting the class a question about whether he is finished, or has a question.

Check Status of Disruptive Learner. Teacher asks a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was noticed by other students a question about whether he is finished or has a question.

Ask Academic Question of Inattentive Learner. Teacher asks a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was not noticed by other students a content-related question.

Asks Academic Question of Disruptive Learner. Teacher asks a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and

(appendix continues)

whose behavior was noticed by other students a content-related question.

Cite Rule to Inattentive Learner. Teacher reminds a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was not noticed by other students of a class rule he is apparently supposed to know.

Cite Rule to Disruptive Learner. Teacher reminds a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was noticed by other students of a class rule he is apparently supposed to know.

Desist to Inattentive Learner. In a determined but non-punitive manner, the teacher tells an inattentive learner to stop doing something.

Desist to Disruptive Learner. In a determined but non-punitive manner, the teacher tells a disruptive learner to stop doing something.

Public Rebuke to Inattentive Learner. Teacher shows anger or displeasure toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him but whose behavior is not noticeable by other students.

Public Rebuke to Disruptive Learner. Teacher shows anger or displeasure toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior is noticed by others in the class.

(appendix continues)

whose behavior was noticed by other students a content-related question.

Cite Rule to Inattentive Learner. Teacher reminds a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was not noticed by other students of a class rule he is apparently supposed to know.

Cite Rule to Disruptive Learner. Teacher reminds a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior was noticed by other students of a class rule he is apparently supposed to know.

Desist to Inattentive Learner. In a determined but non-punitive manner, the teacher tells an inattentive learner to stop doing something.

Desist to Disruptive Learner. In a determined but non-punitive manner, the teacher tells a disruptive learner to stop doing something.

Public Rebuke to Inattentive Learner. Teacher shows anger or displeasure toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him but whose behavior is not noticeable by other students.

Public Rebuke to Disruptive Learner. Teacher shows anger or displeasure toward a learner who is not engaged in the task structured for him and whose behavior is noticed by others in the class.

(appendix continues)

General Teacher Behaviors

Gave Step-by-Step Instructions. Teacher clearly explained the sequence the learners would go through in order to complete a task or assignment.

Questioned Group About Work. Teacher asks questions about something learners are supposed to have already completed.

Helped Learner. Teacher clarified a misunderstanding or gave a hint to a learner.

Asked Learner to Explain Work. Teacher asked a learner to explain something from work underway or completed.

Urged Learner Answer/Comment. Teacher tried to elicit an answer from a learner by prompting, encouragement, or asking leading questions.

Urged Learner to Try Harder. Teacher encouraged a learner when he appeared ready to quit.

Reassured Learner. Teacher encouraged a learner to believe he could succeed another time.

Checked Understanding. Teacher asked if either a learner or the group understood what was being discussed or the point being made.

Corrected Learner Error. When a learner's written or oral response was incorrect, the teacher gave the correct answer.

Reminded Learner of Rule. Teacher restated a class rule to either an individual or the class.

Recognized Special Need of Learner. Teacher either said or did something clearly related to a specific condition of a

(appendix continues)

learner. The condition could be either permanent, such as a physical handicap, or temporary, such as a cold.

Ignored Learner Bid for Attention. Teacher did not respond to a learner trying to get her attention in a way that the learner felt snubbed.

Ignored Learner Answer/Comment. When a learner made a comment or answered a question, the teacher did not acknowledge it so that the learner felt snubbed.

Lost Touch with Class. Teacher became so absorbed in what she was doing that she was unaware of the activities of the learners.

Stayed in Same Place. Teacher did not move during the entire period.

Summarized. Teacher recapitulated the main points of a lesson or part of the lesson.

Called for Quiet, Order. Teacher requested that the class either remain orderly, return to orderly conduct, or be quiet.

Showed Sense of Humor. Teacher laughed, told a joke, or consciously did something which the class found amusing.

Showed Consideration for Learner. Teacher's actions or words expressed thoughtfulness toward a learner.

Showed Irritation. Teacher was noticeably peevish, annoyed, or exasperated.

Was Courteous to Learner. Teacher was polite to a learner.

Asked Learner About Feelings. Teacher asked learner a question which allowed the learner to express his opinions or feelings about something in the lesson.

(appendix continues)

Praised Learner Publicly. Teacher showed pleasure about a student's behavior in a way noticed by the class.

Gave Reason for Praise. Teacher gave reason for praising a learner.

Allowed Learner Choice of Activity. Teacher had several tasks or activities and permitted the learner to select one to work on.